COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. VII. No. 18.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1805. [PRICE 10D.

"The Sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprized the hypocrites. But, he that walketh "righteously and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, and that shaketh "his hand from the holding of bribes; he shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the "munitions of rocks."——ISAIAH: chap. XXXIII. v. 14.

TO THE SERIOUS AND IMPARTIAL CONSIDERATION OF THE HONEST, PATRIOTIC, AND LOYAL MEN OF ENGLAND ARE SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS ON THE

CONDUCT OF MR. PITT.

Freely to make observations on, openly and undisguisedly to approve of or to censure, the conduct of men in place and power, is the undoubted right of every subject of this realm; and, in every one, who, through the means of the press, undertakes to communicate political information to the public, it is not only a right but a duty. In speaking of the Liberty of the Press, we should always remember that which is but too often forgotten, to discriminate carefully as to the objects and the occasions, to which the due exercise of this liberty applies; because, from an indiscriminate application either of the words or of the thing, doubts frequently arise, and, indeed, it becomes a disputable point, whether the thing, of which we boast so much, be a good or an evil, and, of course, whether it ought to be encouraged or suppressed. The inutility, and the public as well as individual injury, in many cases, of exposing, through the means of the press, the faults of persons in private life, is so obvious, that, though no more than the truth be so exposed, the act, from whatever motive proceeding, seldom fails, in this puling age, to meet with general disapprobation. Perceiving this propensity of the mind, all those who wish to prevent a freedom of language with regard to public men, take care, first to confound public with private character and faults; next to give the appellation of slander to all censure indiscriminately; and, then to break forth into a high-wrought description of the odiousness and wickedness of slander.——Whether the art of printing has proved, to mankind in general and to this nation in particular, a fortunate, or an unfortunate discovery; whether that mode of applying this art, which is here denominated the Liberty of the Press, ought, or ought not to have been tolerated; these are questions which we have not now to discuss. The art has been discovered; the Liberty of the Press exists; and, in exercising this liberty, we should not regard it as an indulgence; as something that is winked at; nor, with respect to our own duty, as a right which we may either exercise, or not, as our interest or our caprice may happen to dictate. We should recollect, that our laws, our public regulations and institutions, are framed with the knowledge of the existence of a certain influence in the press. All legislators leave something to be effected through the influence of religion, morality, and public opinion; and, ours fail not to make, besides, an allowance for the influence of the Press. The Liberty of the Press, therefore, really forms a part of the present constitution of our government; and, when exercised with respect to the public character or conduct of public men, there seems to be no sound reason for circumscribing it within any other boundary than that of the TRUTH; especially when it be remembered, that these public men have it at all times in their power to cause the press to be used in their behalf; and when it is well-known, that they do cause it so to be used, and that, too, at the expense of the public. A sophistical mode of statement has been employed in order to screen public men from the animadversions of the press. We have been told, that their character is *public property*; that it ought, therefore, to be carefully watched over by the law. True, in the plain sense of the words. But, by this careful watching is meant a power in the law to punish men for writing *truth*, if in censure, of public men. Here, then, is the deception: the character of public men is public property; but, it is their *true* character; and no man should, therefore, be liable to punishment for writing the truth of public men; yet, I am afraid, that, if any one had written the truth of Lord Melville two months ago, he would not have been permitted to prove that truth; and, probably, he might have lost his ears for endeavouring to open the eyes of his countrymen. While, however, this doctrine restrains the press within very narrow bounds as to the follies and the crimes of men in power, it makes ample amends on the side of their wisdom and their virtue, both of which, in the highest possible degree, we are freely permitted to attribute to them, though they are well known to be fools or

knaves. Yet, seeing that their character is "public property;" seeing that the law considers, or is made to consider, the public as a party deeply interested in such cases, it would, I think, be very hard to show, that false praise is not as likely to be injurious to the public as false censure, of public men. TRUTH is, in such cases, the boundary marked out by reason, by justice, and by the spirit of the laws and constitution of the kingdom; and, while we confine ourselves within that boundary, we must set at defiance the outcry of those, who, for reasons which are obvious enough, stigmatize as a libeller every man that ventures to satirize the conduct of a minister of state. "There is not," says Pope, "in the world a greater error, "than that which fools are so apt to fall "into, and knaves with good reason to en-"courage, the mistaking of a *satirist* for a "*libeller*; whereas to a true satirist nothing "is so odious as a libeller, for the same rea-"son as to a man truly virtuous nothing is "so hateful as a hypocrite." With respect to the character and conduct of persons in private life this doctrine may, as was before observed, be too full of terrors to the childish follies, and low, beggarly vices, of the present day; but, if it be not admitted with respect to the public character and conduct of men in place and in power; if they can, and do, at all times, command four-fifths of the press; if their partisans are permitted constantly to ply the public with praises of every part of their character and conduct; if even their vices and their crimes are thus made the subject of eulogium: if all this be so, and if, nevertheless, a man is liable to punishment for uttering the TRUTH in censure of men in place and power; then is the Liberty of the Press, considered as a check upon such men, a mere mockery; while, on the other hand, it is to them a most convenient instrument in deluding the people into an approbation of, or, at least, a quiet submission to, measures, against which, were they left to judge from their own observation and feelings, their minds could not fail to revolt.

But, viewing the Liberty of the Press as something real; something that is, in truth, to be used as a means of preserving the nation from the consequences of the ignorance, the folly, or the wickedness, of public men; viewing the Liberty of the Press in this light, it will be, I think, readily allowed, that those amongst us, who have it in their power, are, at this time, called upon to exercise it in its most extensive latitude, and in every way which is likely to prove efficacious in arresting the progress of that system of corruption, by the means of which we have been reduced to our present dangerous and disgraceful situation. We feel that we are making, each of us according to his rank and capacity, great sacrifices for the preservation of our country and our government; but, we have the mortification to see, that, in almost every instance, these sacrifices are useless; and, that the danger keeps rolling on as rapidly and with as menacing an aspect as if no sacrifices whatever had been made to avert it. The toils, expenses, and deprivations of a nine years' war, were lately compensated by a peace which robbed us of the honours won by our forefathers, and which afforded us not an hour of repose. We are again at war with the same enemy, and we have the misfortune to see our affairs under the guidance of the same minister, who, during the last war, a hundred times solemnly promised us, that he never would make peace without obtaining for us "indemnity for the past and "security for the future." Already has this war lasted two years. Constantly, during the whole of that time, have we been kept in a state of alarm for the safety of our property and our lives; preparations have been made for surrounding the metropolis with a fortification; for inundating the counties where the enemy may be expected to land; for fleeing from the place of his landing, for driving away or killing our cattle, for destroying our provisions, and for burning our barns and houses; and this, too, let it be well remembered, at a time when our ministers tell us, that they have eight hundred thousand men in arms, a number twice as great as that of all the armies of France put together! While we are thus kept in a constant dread of the enemy; trembling for our lives, and, apparently having no hope in our own exertions, our enemy is stretching his power in every direction; he is hardly noticing us, and when he does cast his looks towards us, it is only to laugh us to scorn. Nor is there any hope, if the present system be persevered in, that this our disgrace will ever end but in our actual subjugation to the enemy; that is to say, in our becoming the slaves of Frenchmen. For, do we not see, that we are led on from bad to worse; that we daily become weaker and weaker in proportion to the strength of our enemy? At the close of the last war, that enemy was unable to send a squadron to sea; but he has now two squadrons at sea, threatening the very existence of our most valuable colonies, and even the mother-country herself, while he is, besides, able to keep two or three of our fleets continually occupied in watching his harbours: and, in short,

it must be evident to every man tolerably well-informed as to such matters, that, with our present system of politics, every year will greatly reduce our means of defence as well as of offence, and will, in the same degree, add to the means of France. During the two years which this war has lasted, one single moment of relaxation from anxiety and exertion the nation has not known. There is no way, in which it is possible to call upon a people to support the cause of their country, which has not been resorted to. The people have chearfully answered every call; and they have patiently submitted to fines imposed for their having failed in the performance of that which it must be acknowledged they were unable to perform. Yet, we see, in the state of our national concerns, no signs of any such sacrifices and exertions having been made. No impression upon the enemy; no enterprises, but such as serve to expose us to ridicule, undertaken; no aid obtained upon the continent of Europe; no measure adopted that promises to afford us security at home; nothing that can give us the most distant hope of permanent peace, or of the slightest alleviation of our burdens. All with us is effort without effect; every blow that we meditate proves abortive; every stroke falls short of its object; some invisible agent appears to come between us and the attainment of whatever is for our good; our offerings upon the altar of our country, like those of the worshippers of Bell and the Dragon, have, in one department at least, been conveyed away for the private uses of those, to whose care they were entrusted. Thus situated, already in danger and disgrace, and menaced with an addition of both, it becomes us strictly to examine into the conduct of those to whose hands our affairs are committed, and especially the conduct of that person who is placed at the head of this important superintendence.

In calling for public censure of the conduct of Mr. Pitt, I am fully aware of the still considerable prejudice that is to be encountered. We are all of us very much the creatures of habit. It has long been the habit of many good men to approve, without much examination, of every thing said and done by Mr. Pitt, and to give him their support accordingly. Attachments of this sort are not so easily shaken as some of those of a more private nature; for, besides that we are less vigilant in public than in private concerns, besides that the indulgence of false pride, in adhering to our errors, costs us less in the former than in the latter case, we are prone, from a weakness of almost universal prevalence, to prefer being thought ignorant of our own business than ignorant of the business of the state; and, you shall hardly find a man amongst your acquaintance, who will not, without the least reluctance or reserve, acknowledge himself to have been the dupe of a crafty servant or professed friend, and yet who will not resort to every species of disguise, rather than confess that he has been deceived in the character of a political leader. This propensity, when not carried beyond the limits of reason and of honour, when confined to the excusing of venial political sins, is to be applauded; because, without a readiness to make such allowances, there can be nothing worthy of the name of attachment. But, when it is pushed to extremes; when the resolution to adhere is so strong as to set at nought the dictates of truth and of justice, then the adherent becomes a mere partisan; and we are, upon no principle of charity, forbidden to consider him as an ignorant, an obstinate, or an interested person. Lightly to change our opinion of those, whom we have long greatly admired and extolled, is a mark of that weakness and fickleness, which are but too frequently accompanied with a want of integrity; but, on the other hand, to persevere in professing an opinion which has been proved to us to be ill-founded, and which, therefore, we do not entertain, is, especially when the interests of our country are at stake, an act of insincerity highly criminal, and characteristic of a mind destitute of every just and generous sentiment. With respect to this description of the friends of Mr. Pitt, and, I believe, to those of most other public men, there generally exists, too, the suspicious circumstance, that the adherence is to persons *in power*; were it not for which circumstance one would wish to find an excuse for inviolable attachment even to the statesman in question. But, this little point taken into view, one cannot help fearing, that, at bottom, the attachment is to the *power*, and not to the person, who, if once deprived of that, would see his adherents yielding to that indignation, which his recent deeds are, I think it will appear, eminently calculated to excite.

"If satire, prudent, knows its time and place,
"You still may lash the greatest——*in disgrace*:
"For merit will, by turns, forsake them all;
"Would you know when? exactly *when they fall*."

Of the practical truth of these maxims Mr. Pitt must be thoroughly convinced; and, accordingly, he appears resolved, at the price of whatever humiliations, to cling to place and power to the last possible moment. Far be it from me to insinuate, that *all* those, who remain attached to Mr. Pitt, are ac-

tuated by motives so base; for, on the contrary, I believe, that there are many whose motives are perfectly good. But then, surveying that gentleman's conduct for some years' past, I can want nothing to convince me, that these persons, though upright, and though, perhaps, generally speaking, of enlightened minds, are destitute of adequate information, or are grossly deceived, as to this particular subject. Amongst those, therefore, to whom these observations are submitted, I have this description of persons more immediately in my eye. They will, some of them at least, recollect, that I myself was once, in the narrow sphere of my influence, a supporter of Mr. Pitt; and, I am persuaded, that they will not doubt of my having been actuated by motives which, at least, were free from the imputation of selfishness. I thought him a wise, high-minded, and upright statesman; and, unless I produce grounds amply to justify a total change of opinion in this respect, they will, of course, charge me with inconsistency; but, if I do produce such grounds, it will surely be not unreasonable, that, in the name of consistency, I call on them to follow my example. The limits, within which I shall be compelled to confine myself, will not permit me to make a very free use of quotation or of reference. I have, indeed, room for little more than a plain unvarnished narrative: but then, I will adduce no fact that can, with truth, be contradicted; and, as to the inferences, they will, if erroneous, be open to the detection of the reader. The same motive whence I have been induced to make this serious appeal to the honesty, patriotism, and loyalty of my countrymen, will, of course, induce me to give to it the widest circulation I am able: yet, convinced that no cause, which stands in need of unfair advantage, either can or ought to triumph, I hold myself bound to publish through the same channel, and with all convenient speed, any comment (signed with the name of the writer) that may be made and transmitted to me, upon the whole, or upon any part, of what I now offer to the public.

Having thus, clearly and candidly, though, perhaps, with somewhat too much of tediousness, stated the object which I have in view, and the manner in which I propose to endeavour to effect that object, I shall proceed to describe the conduct of Mr. Pitt, FIRST, from his quitting office in February, 1801, to April, 1804. SECOND, from his return to office in May, 1804 to March last. THIRD, since the Tenth Report of the Naval Commissioners was printed, comparing the principles he has now acted upon with those which he professed in the early part of his public life.

FIRST: it is hardly necessary to remind the reader, that, at the time when Mr. Pitt resigned, in 1801, we were engaged in war, and that the epoch, though not the most, was certainly not the least, alarming of that war. The ground of his resignation, as it was afterwards clearly avowed by himself in the House of Commons, was this, as expressed in his own words, on the 10th of February, 1801: "It was upon the turn which the "Catholic Question took, the success of "which I conceive to be essentially neces"sary to the strength, prosperity and una"nimity of the United Kingdoms, that I "felt myself bound in *conscience* and in *ho*"*nour*, to give in my resignation. The "*early* discussion and decision of that ques"tion were incumbent upon those, who "under the circumstances of the union, "considered it as a measure of the *utmost* "*importance* to the strength and tranquillity "of the empire. So strong is my convic"tion of the propriety and *necessity* of that "measure, that *I could not continue to re*"*main a member of that government* which "deemed it inexpedient to entertain it." This was the open declaration of his motives for resigning; and, it is necessary to observe here, that, at the time of Mr. Pitt's resigning, and making the above declaration, there were two papers circulated amongst the Roman Catholics of Ireland, assuring them that Mr. Pitt would never return to office without bringing forward and supporting their claims.—Leaving this topic for the present we must now follow him to his conduct at the time of making the peace with France, first, however noticing what passed relative to the formation of Mr. Addington's ministry. Mr. Addington was, it is now ascertained, selected by his Majesty himself; but, Mr. Pitt, to whose father Addington's father had been family Doctor, and who, from a barrister of little or no note, had raised Addington to the Chair of the House of Commons, finding Addington chosen by the King, made haste to show his approbation of the choice; and, indeed, Mr. Addington did not consent to become minister till he had consulted with, and obtained the approbation of, and a positive promise of support from Mr. Pitt. Nay, Mr. Pitt *offered to remain in place*, upon certain conditions, after Mr. Addington had been thus selected by the King; though, it will be remembered, that the Lords Spencer and Grenville and Mr. Windham had gone out of office with him; and, this offer was made without any appro-

bation on their part. The offer was not accepted; but, Mr. Pitt had the choosing of the persons who were to come into the ministry in lieu of those, who had resigned with him; and, the reader will, therefore, bear in mind, that this was a ministry of his own choosing, and obviously intended by him as the mere delegates of his power in the government.——When the peace came before the public, Mr. Pitt, whom the ministry had consulted in every stage of the negotiations, and who retained, in fact, as much authority as if he had still been minister, supported it in parliament. He not only supported it with his vote upon every important question arising out of it; but he by words defended it, and gave to all and every part of it his most unqualified approbation, declaring that the ministers, who made it, were entitled to the hearty thanks and the lasting gratitude of their country. Here the people, had not their senses been drowned in the delirious and fleeting joy of the day, would have recalled to their minds the solemn resolutions which he had so often expressed, the solemn promises which he had so often made them, during the war, and the whole of which he had now broken and falsified. He had solemnly declared, not much more than two years before, "that war might be carried on for any "length of time without the creation of "new debt; that it would not be difficult "to provide taxes for eight years; that he "never would be satisfied with false se-"curity; and that he never would consent "to any peace, but such an one as should "at once restore to Europe her settled and "balanced constitution of general polity, and "to every negociating power in particular, "that weight in the scale of general empire, "which has ever been found the best gua-"rantee and pledge of local independence "and general security." Yet, did he help to negociate, and finally express his unqualified approbation of, a peace in which *all* these objects were abandoned. The kingdom of Sardinia he left a conquest to France; of Italy Buonaparté took possession in the quality of President, at the very moment that the treaty was negociating; Portugal ceded part of her foreign dominions to France; Switzerland was left under the controul of a French army; Naples in a situation very little better; and Holland in a state of dependence as complete as if it were a province of France. And, as to this kingdom, what degree of *security* he obtained for it, the reader, be his rank in life what it may, hardly needs to be asked. No security have we since felt; not one moment of tranquillity have we since that day experienced. In that peace he tacitly surrendered the honour of the flag; because, in former treaties it was stipulated for, and in that of Amiens it was not; therefore the omission amounted to a positive surrender; the surrender of an honour, claimed by England from the earliest days; demanded by her and yielded to her in the reigns of even her most pusillanimous princes, retained through every vicissitude of her fortune, every change in her dynasties, and every revolution in her government; sometimes, indeed, neglected, and sometimes impaired, but at all times in existence; at all times the pride and the boast of Englishmen, and never completely abandoned and effaced from the heraldry of nations, till the administration of WILLIAM PITT! Let this be recorded upon the pedestal of his STATUE, and, on the reverse, let it be engraven by the hand of some indignant Englishman: "this was the man, through whose coun-"sels was surrendered the dearest birth-"right of Englishmen, the Lillies and the "title won by their fathers in the fields of "France, and handed down untarnished till "the days of his all-degrading administra-"tion!"——Such was the result of a war, begun, conducted, and concluded by Mr. Pitt alone, with the exception of the share that was taken by his worthy associate Dundas; for, it is well known, and will not be denied, that the cabinet was so constructed as to render nearly nugatory the counsel of every one, whose opinions or views differed from theirs. During the ten months of nominal peace, which followed the conclusion of this ignominious compact, Mr. Pitt kept aloof from both the court and the parliament. The peace, in order to obtain which and to slur over some other difficulties, were, as we shall by and by clearly perceive, the real objects of his resignation, was, however, soon found to be attended with a danger of a most alarming nature, namely, that of causing the numerous *admirers* and adherents of Mr. Pitt to forget that Mr. Pitt was in existence! The nation began to perceive, that government could go on without him; the people seemed very willing to indulge him in his love of retirement; and, indeed, he was upon the point of sinking out of sight for ever. To prevent this, tricks that would have disgraced mountebanks or hireling harlots were played off by his partizans, who, in order to keep his name alive, contrived, and, in conjunction with certain Jews and contractors, grown rich under him, actually set on foot the scheme of erecting a STATUE in honour

of him; in honour of a man, under whose sway the nation had been more burdened and disgraced than ever nation before was in the world! Finding that this scheme did not succeed to their wishes; perceiving that the name of Pitt was pronounced every day less and less frequently, they had recourse to other contrivances. The public writers, who yet lived in hopes of his return to power, endeavoured, by all the means they could devise, to awaken the remembrance of the public. Mr. Pitt was, they told us, resolved to devote the remainder of his life to agricultural pursuits. They lamented, that there was no prospect of ever seeing him again even in his place in parliament. His close adherent Mr. Canning, told the House of Commons, that his Right Hon. friend was "labouring to *detach* the people "of England from him;" and, he had the cruel mortification to observe that the House seemed to say, "God send your friend suc-"cess." Next, we were told, in the Pitt newspapers, that Mr. Pitt proposed to go abroad, and travel over the continent of Europe. All would not do. The nation seemed quite indifferent as to what became of him. As a last shift, we were assured that he was dangerously sick; and, incredible as it may seem, he actually went to Bath for his recovery, though it was afterwards found, that, at that very moment, he was willing to return to office, and, of course, to take upon him those duties which it is impossible for a person in ill-health to perform. Still the nation was insensible. Neither the threatened absence, nor death, of Mr. Pitt appeared to produce any effect whatever upon the public mind. All the inventions of meanness, of beggarly ambition, were exhausted, and to no purpose; and, to the new war it was that he was solely indebted for a temporary resuscitation. A new war, so suddenly following the peace, Mr. Addington was afraid to encounter without calling in assistance. Great coolness had begun to prevail between him and Mr. Pitt; but, by the interposition of Lord Melville (the useful and faithful Lord Melville!) a reconciliation was effected. It was proposed that Mr. Pitt, Lord Melville and others should come into the ministry, and Addington himself was ready to resign his place of Prime Minister to Mr. Pitt. The terms of Mr. Pitt were, however, not acceded to: the negociation broke off, and Mr. Pitt, after having first made his appearance in Parliament, and said enough to convince the public that he was no longer the political friend of Mr. Addington, retired again to the country. This was in the spring of 1803, just upon the breaking out of the war. For several weeks after the parliament met again, Mr. Pitt kept away, leaving his partizans to show their and his hostility to the ministry; that ministry, every member of which he himself had chosen, or recommended! After the Christmas recess he occasionally made his appearance, and affected the air of a man perfectly independent, sometimes voting on one side and sometimes on the other. It was not till the month of March, 1804, that he came forward with an open and direct attack upon the ministry; and, it is not unimportant to observe, that the particular point, selected for the assault, was LORD ST. VINCENT, to discredit, and, if possible, to remove whom appeared evidently to be a favourite object with Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville, an object which we now perceive it was very natural for them to have deeply at heart. We can *now* be at no loss for the motive of the extraordinary activity of Lord Melville in collecting those *forty proxies*, which he was, by the ministerial newspapers, said to bring in his pocket to the house of peers, on the evening that the intended resignation of the Addington ministry was announced; and, indeed, the eagerness of Lord Melville to work himself and Mr. Pitt into the cabinet, in the spring of 1803, was, there is every reason to presume, considerably increased by certain forebodings with respect to the consequences of those Inquiries which had just then been begun by the Naval Commissioners. This conjecture is, too, corroborated by the points of difference, upon which the negociation for return to office at that time is, on both sides, said to have broken off. Mr. Pitt proposed to bring in with him, amongst others, LORD SPENCER. If Lord Spencer came, he must come as First Lord of the Admiralty; and, of course, Lord St. Vincent must have been turned out of that post. That Lord Spencer would not have been a tool in the hands of Pitt and Dundas they knew; but, the Naval Commission had not originated with Lord Spencer, and it might have appeared to him, as it did to many others; it might have appeared to him, as, indeed, it had appeared to him before, and to Lord St. Vincent himself, attended with too many difficulties to be executed in time of war. By bringing him back, therefore, and removing Lord St. Vincent, there was reason to expect that the Naval Commission, which had scarcely commenced its operations, would have been suspended during the war; and, if another came to be appointed, the appointment would have been, at least as to a majority of the board, with Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville.

This was a main point to carry. It is absurd to suppose, that Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt did not perceive the storm that was brewing; and, when we reflect on the obvious impolicy of their conduct, viewed in any other light, it is perfectly reasonable to attribute it to the motive here suggested. When reminded, upon the occasion here alluded to, of the eulogium he had pronounced on Lord St. Vincent, when he recommended him to the parliament and the nation; when reminded, that he had then described his lordship as a rock of safety to the country, as a person whose very name at the Admiralty would operate as a discouragement to the enemy; when reminded of this, Mr. Pitt made an attempt to distinguish between the military and the civil capacity of his lordship, though such a distinction could avail him nothing, seeing that it was in the capacity in which he had eulogized and recommended him. His conduct, in this respect, is no longer mysterious: we now clearly perceive the cause of his change of opinion, with regard to that nobleman, of whose official power it appeared to be his principal object to get rid.

SECOND: the conduct of Mr. Pitt from his return to office, in May, 1804, to the month of March last, presents a tissue of inconsistencies, of miserable expedients and stratagems, surpassed only by what he has since exhibited, and never before equalled. From the time of his direct attack on Lord St. Vincent, in March, 1804, he kept no measures with the administration, of which that nobleman formed a part. He co-operated with the Opposition in their efforts to produce a change of the persons in his Majesty's councils, which object was accomplished early in the month of May.—There was no arrangement between Mr. Fox, or between any part of the Opposition, and Mr. Pitt; but, certain persons well known to be close in Mr. Pitt's confidence, and, of course, understood to speak his sentiments, which they communicated as distinctly as is usual upon such occasions, did declare to the members of the Opposition, that it was the sincere intention of Mr. Pitt, and, indeed, his firm resolution, to enter into no scheme of administration, which should not be so broad and comprehensive as to embrace all the eminent talents in the country, and effectually to subdue party animosities. I believe few of the persons alluded to thought this profession sincere; and that I never did, for one moment, I need appeal only to my readers, whom I endeavoured to keep constantly on their guard against what appeared to me evidently intended to deceive. The result is known. Instead of a ministry, embracing all the distinguished talents and supported by a vast majority of the men of high rank and great landed property, we, in a few days, saw Mr. Pitt on the Treasury Bench, surrounded with nothing but his own creatures and with several of those same identical persons, towards whom, only ten or twelve days before, he had used every term and epithet that his mind could suggest, descriptive of their unworthiness as ministers, and of his contempt. An effort was, indeed, made by him to draw LORD SPENCER and some others into his scheme; but, this extended no farther than would have been useful in breaking the power of the Opposition, without endangering the complete preponderance, in the cabinet, of the influence of himself and his associate Lord Melville. The public, who were utterly disappointed by the new arrangement that had taken place, thought, at first, that Mr. Pitt would never attempt to conduct the affairs of the nation with such miserably feeble assistance. But, the public little thought of the motives, which we now perceive must have existed; they little thought, that there was an inquiry at that moment going on, which would so soon put Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt upon their trial: had they been apprised of this, they would not have wondered to see those gentlemen apparently resolved to keep, as long as possible, and by whatever means, possession of those places and of that influence and power, of the inestimable utility of which, to persons in the situation they had reason to anticipate, the reader must, from what he has recently seen, be fully sensible.——Mr. Pitt, who had gone out of office in 1801, upon the ground, by himself openly and clearly stated to the parliament, that "he could not, in *conscience* and in "*honour* form part of a government," which did not deem it proper to bring forward the Catholic Question, must have come into office in 1804, under a combination of national circumstances more favourable than those of 1801, with a resolution *not* to bring forward, and not to permit others to bring forward, the Catholic Question, which question he has now positively refused to submit to parliament. It will be recollected, that he had declared the measure to be "*essen-*"*tially necessary* to the strength, prosperity, "and security of the United Kingdom;" and yet, as I expressly stated at the time (Reg. 12 May, 1804, p. 778), it was, upon his re-entering the cabinet, a preliminary stipulation, that he should "*not revive the* "*Catholic Question*," a stipulation, to which he is now adhering in direct contradiction to

his public and solemn declarations. "Why," say those who are still endeavouring to apologize for his conduct, "if the King will "not let him bring forward the Catholic "Question, what can he do?" To which I answer by asking, what did he do *before?* He resigned. Neither "*conscience* nor *ho*-"*nour*" would let him remain in. Has he then got rid of that conscience and honour? Or, has he silenced these monitors? It is impossible, that when he re-entered the cabinet, he should not have foreseen this and many other embarrassments; quite impossible, and, therefore, his re-entering, under a stipulation not to bring forward the measure, is a presumptive proof of his being actuated by some motive stronger than a mere love of place and of domination, though, in his breast, that love is, I acknowledge, remarkably strong.——Having obtained possession of the cabinet, we see, that, though the Board of Naval Commissioners could not be dissolved, every step was taken likely to check the progress of their proceedings. Lord Melville himself was placed at the head of the Admiralty, a situation which made him an object of "attachment" with every one in any of the offices, into which the Commissioners could possibly go. Mr. Canning, the political creature of Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville, was placed at the head of the Treasury of the Navy, the office in which the dreaded inquiry was to take place; and Mr. Trotter, the Paymaster, who had been, very properly, displaced by Mr. Tierney, was immediately re-instated, though it appears from Mr. Canning's own declaration, that he had never even *seen* Trotter before in his life. What, let the reader ask himself; what, but the influence of Mr. Pitt or Lord Melville, could have induced Mr. Canning to make this re-instatement, especially as he must have known that a salary of 800*l.* a year was of no consequence to Trotter, while he himself could not have been in want of friends, if not of relations, on whom to bestow such a salary? That the Commissioners experienced great inconvenience from the hindrance thrown in their way by Mr. Canning, they have pointedly stated in their Tenth Report, where they say, (See Reg. p. 479), that, to precepts, which they issued to him on the 10th and 17th of July, they received no answer till the 2d of October, when, upon writing to him again, they were informed by him, that he had consulted counsel to know whether he was, by law, *compelled* to comply with the Commissioners' request. They further state, that they had met with no such difficulties in any of the other departments; and they conclude by stating, that, if such difficulties were general, all inquiry would be rendered nugatory. Now, if the change of ministry had not taken place; if Lord St. Vincent had remained at the Admiralty, and Mr. Tierney at Somerset House; or, if any other persons than Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville had been in power; in either of these cases, I leave the reader to judge, whether the inquiry would not, in all probability, have led to a result even more complete and important than that which was produced. The Commissioners were, however, men not to be turned aside from their duty, not to be intimidated nor easily to be wearied or disgusted. They proceeded steadily on; and after the examination of Lord Melville, which took place on the 5th of November last, the affair began to assume a serious aspect. It must have been clearly foreseen, that the report upon these proceedings would become a subject of parliamentary investigation. Mr. Pitt has expressed his contempt of a cabinet where there is any counting of noses; but, he has never let drop a similar sentiment with regard to other assemblies, whether consisting of *six hundred* or of *twenty-one*. His majority, at the end of the preceding session, was not very considerable, and though strengthened, perhaps, by some few recruits during the summer, was not regarded as sufficient to meet the approaching storm. The parliament, which was to meet in November, was, it will be well remembered, prorogued, from time to time, till the 15th of January, to the great surprise of every one not in the secret. *Now*, however, the delay is fully accounted for. It was employed in endeavovring to form a junction, first with Lord Moira and others, and, having met with a refusal in that quarter, next with Mr. Addington and his friends, where there was no refusal. It is not unnecessary to repeat, that Lord Melville saw the determined countenances of the Naval Commissioners, for the first time, on the 5th of November; on the 14th of that month the ministerial papers announced an approaching coalition between the ministry and Lord Moira and others; and on the 17th of December took place the reconciliation between Mr. Addington and Mr. Pitt, which was *first proposed* in a letter from Mr. Pitt through the hands of Lord Hawkesbury. These facts cannot be denied, and, when the reader considers how sensible Mr. Pitt must have been of the humiliation of thus crawling and whining for support to a man whom he had made and unmade at his pleasure, and whom, only a few months before, he had turned out under the loudly preferred charges of "*incapa-*

"*city* and *imbecillity;*" when he recollects in what general contempt this conduct was held, and how that contempt was heightened, day after day, by the succession of degrading events, which occurred for the first month or two after the reconciliation was effected; when he reflects on these circumstances, remembering, at the same time, the naturally and habitually haughty and over-bearing character of the man, who submitted to all these unspeakable mortifications, rather than resign that place which he had formerly flung up at the first attempt at resistance on the part of his Sovereign; when the reader has taken a full and clear view of this combination of facts and circumstances, he will, I think, have little hesitation in agreeing with me, that the motive of Mr. Pitt, in making all these degrading submissions, must have been singularly powerful; that the object he had in contemplation could, in fact, have been nothing short of keeping possession of the means of making assurance double sure, and, to use his own favorite phrase, obtaining, in the approaching proceedings, "*indemnity* "for the past and *security* for the future." ——On the 18th of February, after the Tenth Report of the Naval Commissioners was laid before the House of Commons, but before it was printed, the Budget, containing a statement of the money wanted for the year, was submitted by the minister. The introduction of this subject at so early a season, contrary to the usual custom, which had reserved it for the month of April or May, excited, we all remember, much speculation. Some thought, and indeed said, that it was a strong symptom of Mr. Pitt's intention to resign, it being regarded as a point of ministerial etiquette to make the necessary pecuniary provisions previous to quitting the Treasury. Others imagined, that the step was intended to convince the powers on the Continent, that the minister had the means of fulfilling his engagements with them; though it appeared utterly incredible, that any one who had ever seen or read of or heard of England, in these latter days, should doubt of the readiness of His Majesty's faithful Commons to vote whatever sums might be asked of them by any minister. There is *now* little room for conjecture upon the subject. The mystery is most satisfactorily explained; for, whoever views the present scene, and duly considers the state of mens' minds, will, I think, be convinced, that to have served up new taxes in the intervals of the discussions that are now succeeding each other, would have discovered but little taste, and less prudence, in the entertainer. He was well aware of the great inconvenience that this would have created; the computations of what taxes might have been spared if no malversation had been practised or permitted; of the number of bushels of salt that might, in such case, have escaped additional duty; of the number of horses that might still have been allowed to tug on unloaded with another four-shilling impost. Sir Henry Mildmay's complaint of the tax upon his children's legacies might have come forth with the painful omission of a compliment to the wisdom and integrity of the man who was persisting in imposing it; and Mr. Pitt's expert and voluble calculation of the proposed tax upon draught-horses, might have been met with another of the pickings of Mr. Trotter and his principal, not forgetting the crumbs of Mark Sprott. The choice, therefore, of the time for urging forward the Ways and Means, does great credit to the sagacity and foresight of Mr. Pitt; but it serves to show, that he had maturely weighed and fully anticipated the probable consequences of the Tenth Report, and, viewed in connection with the circumstances before-stated, it strongly corroborates the suspicion, that all his party arrangements, for a considerable time back, had been bottomed upon that anticipation.

THIRD.—Having now arrived at the point where we are to enter on a survey of the conduct of Mr. Pitt, subsequent to the printing of the Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry, it will be necessary, previous to any observation upon that conduct, to state what may be called the charges contained in the Report, leaving out, for the sake of simplifying the discussion, the transaction relative to Jellicoe, and, for the same reason, including the charge of supposed connivance, on the part of Mr. Pitt, which is now to be examined into and reported upon by the Select Committee of the House of Commons. Briefly, then, against Lord Melville, the charge, is; *that he, being Treasurer of the Navy with a clear salary of 4,000l. a year, acknowledged by himself to be in full payment of all his services in that office, did, during the space of sixteen years, permit and authorize his deputy to withdraw from the Bank of England, to deposit with a private banker, and to use for private advantage, large sums of the public money, in gross violation of a law framed by himself; and that, being asked, upon his oath, whether he participated in those advantages, he refused to answer, alleging, as the ground of his refusal, that he was in danger of thereby criminating himself and of exposing himself to pains or penalties.* This is the charge against Lord Melville,

fairly stated, and unimpaired by any document that has since been submitted to his judges, who have, accordingly declared him guilty of "a gross violation of the law, and "of a high breach of duty." The charge against Mr. Pitt, as relating to this matter, is; *that he, being First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, knew that certain sums of money, appropriated by act of parliament to Naval purposes, were applied to other public purposes, and, of course, that these sums were drawn from the Bank of England in a manner contrary to law; and that, he, being in the capacity aforesaid, and being informed of the unlawful practices of Lord Melville and his Deputy, did not adopt any measure to put a stop to those practices.* In stating this as a charge against Mr. Pitt, I beg to be distinctly understood, as not meaning to say that he is guilty of it. He is not named in the Report of the Commissioners, though his Secretary is; and, for the honour of the country, we all must hope, that, as to the latter part of the charge in particular, which, if established, would make him an accomplice with Lord Melville, he will appear to be perfectly innocent. What I have, therefore, with respect to him, stated in the form of a charge, is to be considered merely as a brief decription of what is to be the subject of inquiry in the Select Committee; such a description being necessary to the clear comprehension and proper application of the observations I am about to offer on his conduct relative to the recent proceedings, and, in the offering of which observations I shall, as being the most natural as well as the most convenient, follow the order pointed out by the dates of the different discussions, touching on the case of Lord Melville only in such parts and so far as it may be necessary to touch upon in order to elucidate the conduct of Mr. Pitt. ——The charge against Lord Melville was so simple, the delinquency was so flagrant, the proof against him so satisfactory, that it was, by many persons, firmly believed, that Mr. Pitt would not attempt to screen him; and, it will be recollected, that those who have generally been regarded as that gentleman's warmest and most faithful friends, scrupled not to assert, that he would make no such attempt. And, indeed, if we take time to look into the history of Mr. Pitt's public life; if we review the professions, the loudly proclaimed principles, the solemn promises and pledges, by the means of which he ingratiated himself with the people of England, we must, in fairness, allow, that there was some ground whereon to excuse the confidence of his friends upon the present occasion. No small part of these persons must have heard, or read, and, of course, imbibed an early and deep impression from, the parliamentary speeches, with which he began his career; they must have remembered with what seemingly virtuous indignation he, the second time he addressed the House of Commons, burst forth upon the subject of abuses in the expenditure of the public money. "What," said he, in the debate of 31st March, 1781; "what is "it that gives the House of Commons its "importance? What but the power of the "purse? Every branch of the legislature "has something to distinguish it, and that "which at once gives the character and "elevation of the Commons House of "Parliament, is, that they hold the "strings of the national purse, and are "entrusted with the great and important "power, first of granting the money, and "then of correcting the expenditure. . . . . "How humiliating, how miserable a picture "of parliamentary power is it now wished "to be exhibited! So, then, all the power "of parliament, with respect to the alleviation of national burdens, the redress of "grievances, the reform of expense, the "economy, the system, the elucidation of "office, is sunk into a disgraceful negative! "One positive power, indeed, remains; *the "odious power of taxing the people*, whenever the minister thinks proper. The "odious power of making them pay for his "*wild schemes* and *lavish corruption*. . . . . "The minister has disregarded the report "of the Commissioners, a report *delivered "in upon oath*, and having all the facts stated in it ascertained upon the oaths of a "variety of witnesses, and has preferred the "loose conversation of a public board, *suffering them to become the unsworn witnesses in their own cause!* . . . . . And, "here I must remark, and I verily believe "it, on my *credit*, my *honour*, and my *conscience*, that the minister means and designs, that the Commissioners shall spend "their time in *inquiring into trifles*, without going into an examination of any "great, extensive, and important object, the "better *to continue the deception*, and to "carry on the *hypocrisy* and *deceit* that have "already led the House into so many votes "disgraceful to themselves and ruinous to "the public. . . . . I earnestly conjure the "House to use their own eyes, and to consult their own understandings; to return "to a sense of their duty to the people; to "act like *honest* independent members of "parliament, and no longer implicitly *pin "their faith* upon the sleeve of a minister, "whose sole object is to *deceive* and *mislead*, "just as best answers his purpose." Early

impressions are well known to be the most powerful; and, therefore, we are not to wonder, that those whose attachment to Mr. Pitt was founded on his conduct at the outset of his political career, should, especially if they had not been very attentive observers of his progress, have continued that attachment, (proceeding from their high opinion of his purity) to the very eve of Lord Melville's disgrace. How was it possible for those who remembered to have heard him imploring the House of Commons to reform itself, and to banish from its constitution the means of corruption; who remembered to have heard him, on the 7th of May, 1782, congratulate the House upon his Majesty's now having a ministry (consisting of *Lord Rockingham*, *Mr. Fox*, and others) "under "whom the corrupt influence of the crown "would not be exerted; but, at the same "time, beseeching the House to provide for "the future, and to take care that in no "time this secret and dark system should be "revived, to contaminate the fair and ho"nourable fabric of our government; this "influence being of the most pernicious "kind, and, having at all times been point"ed to as the fertile source of all our mise"ries, had, of late, been substituted in the "room of wisdom, of activity, of exertion, "and of success. It was," he said "but "too naturally connected with the exten"sive limits of our empire, and with the "broad and great scale upon which its ope"rations were conducted. It had been truly "said of this corrupt influence, "that it "" had grown with our growth and "" strengthened with our strength;" but, "that, unhappily for this country it had not "decayed with our decay, nor diminished "with our decrease." Those who remembered to have heard this, and who still retained the impression made by the eloquent expression of his abhorrence of the vile traffic carried on, as he, in the same speech, alleged, between the Treasury and the members of parliament; his abhorrence of the wretches, who "claimed to themselves the "right of bringing their votes to market, "who held out their borough to the best "purchaser, and who, in fact, belonged "more to the Nabob of Arcot than they "did to the people of Great Britain." Those who remembered this, and who, on the 4th of March, 1782, had heard him assert the power, the right, and the duty of parliament to punish delinquent ministers, "let their "rank be what it might." Those who had seen him, on the 8th of March, 1785, when he was become minister himself, instantly appointing a Commission of Inquiry into the abuses of office during the administration of his predecessors; who had seen him resolutely refuse to introduce into the act, constituting that Commission, any clause similar to that under which Lord Melville has taken shelter, alleging, that "innocence stood in "need of no such protection;" those, who, upon that occasion, had heard him exclaim: "What! inquire into and correct trifling "abuses, while those of a more covert, a "more dangerous, and a more extensive na"ture are left to the ordinary control of the "establishment! For *my part*, I can see no "reason for passing over even the most tri"fling abuses, except laziness and pride; "and these are obstacles which, I hope, will "never stand between me and my duty. "Nor can I conceive how, in the present "situation of this country, any person or "persons, to whom the care of its interests "are entrusted, can justify to themselves to "omit any exertion, that may tend, *even in "the most minute particular*, to promote "that economy, on which the recovery of "the state from its present depressed situa"tion so much depends." Those who had heard this; those who had received and long entertained the impression which sentiments like those above quoted were calculated to give to the mind; those persons, especially, if, as was before observed, they had not been very attentive observers of political occurrences, might be naturally expected to repel, with indignation, the idea of Mr. Pitt's becoming the advocate or the apologist of Lord Melville; what, then, must have been the disappointment, what the astonishment and confusion, of these persons at witnessing the recent conduct of Mr. Pitt? At seeing him endeavour to edge into the resolution of censure a phrase, evidently designed to lead the world to believe, that Lord Melville had not understood the intention of the law that he had violated? At hearing him assert, that the public had sustained no actual loss in consequence of the naval money having been diverted to, and employed for, purposes of private emolument? At perceiving him labour to persuade the public, that, because no personal corruption was positively proved, the conduct of Lord Melville was not corrupt? At observing his strenuous efforts to maintain, that, by the vote of censure, Lord Melville was sufficiently punished, and that every thing beyond it was persecution, and must proceed from party and vengeful motives? At listening to the grounds upon which he resisted any further parliamentary inquiry into matters that were to become the subject of legal investigation? And, finally, at witnessing his contrivance, and hearing his defence of, the mode which has been adopted for selecting the committee, appointed to

examine into his own conduct? At hearing and seeing all this, and that, too, in the space of one month, what, again I ask, must have been the feelings of those, whose attachment he had gained by the professions of his youth, and who, without much inquiry or observation, had remained attached to him to the present day?——That, to form a contrast between his former professions and his present practice, will now be an easy matter to his disappointed and mortified adherents, there can be little doubt; but, taking the above points in the order they lie before me, I shall, even at the hazard of wearying by repetition, offer to the reader such materials, for this purpose, as have presented themselves to me.——1. The resolution, expressive of the censure of the House of Commons on Lord Melville, and passed on the 8th of April, is worded as follows: "Resolved, that the Right Hon. Lord Mel-"ville, having been privy to, and having "connived at, the withdrawing from the "Bank of England, for the purpose (as "stated by Lord Melville) of private "emolument to Mr. Trotter, sums is-"sued to Lord Melville as Treasurer of "the Navy, and placed to his account at "the Bank, according to the provsions "of the 25 Geo. III. c. 31, has been "guilty of a gross violation of the law, "and a high breach of duty." In lieu of the words "*gross violation of the law, "and a high breach of duty,*" Mr. Pitt proposed to insert the words, "*contrary to "the* INTENTION *of the law.*" Now, who would not suppose, that this law was not, in the opinion of Mr. Pitt, *misunderstood* by Lord Melville? Every friend of that gentleman, every one who still desires to defend him, must, I think, wish for something to prove, that he might really believe, that Lord Melville had not clearly comprehended the meaning of the law that had been violated. What, then, can those friends possibly say, what excuse can they find for the conduct of Mr. Pitt, when they have now seen that the letter of the law is as plain as that of the lesson of an infant; that the law was *framed by Lord Melville himself*, he being even then in the office to which it related; and, that Mr. Pitt himself, then the colleague of Lord Melville, did, at the time that he moved for leave to bring in the bill, clearly describe it as being principally intended to *prevent the naval money from ever being drawn from the Bank till it was actually wanted for naval services.* What, then, are we to think of his attempt to soften down, to fritter away, to destroy, in fact, the censure finally passed by that assemby, by substituting the words "contrary to the *intention* of the law," in lieu of "a *gross violation* of the law?"—— All of the links of the chain of facts and circumstances are complete. First the people, in 1780, groaning under the accumulated burdens heaped on them by a lavish expenditure, petition the parliament to retrench that expenditure; secondly, we find the House of Commons appointing commissioners to inquire into the means of effecting such retrencement; thirdly, we see the House of Commons passing, in 1782, a resolution that the Treasurer of the Navy and the Paymaster of the Forces should be suffered to derive no profit from the use or interest of the public money; next, the salaries of those officers are greatly augmented by a warrant of His Majesty, in order to compensate them for the loss of what they formerly made by such use or interest; then comes the act regulating the office of the Paymaster of the Forces, which act has been duly executed from the moment it was in force, in 1782, to the present time; after this we find the Commissioners of Accounts recommending a similar act for the regulation of the Office of Treasurer of the Navy; to give this recommendation the greater weight, and to satisfy the people, that His Majesty and his ministers are sincerely solicitous to guard the public treasure from being misapplied, the King, in his speech from the throne, in 1785, calls the attention of the Commons to the subject; the Commons, in a Committee of the whole House, (on the 17th of Feb. 1785,) take the matter into their serious consideration, the minister clearly describes the *intention* of the bill about to be submitted, the bill is submitted (directly afterwards) by the person who is immediately to put it into execution; and, after all this, that very person begins to act, and for sixteen years continues to act, *exactly contrary to the intention* thus solemnly promulgated. And, when the daring violator of the law is at last detected; when a motion of censure on him is proposed in that same assembly, where, with professions of superior purity and of disinterested zeal for the public service, he first stood forward with the draft of that law, then is an attempt made to give to the sense of the House such an expression as to induce the world to believe, that he has disobeyed the law merely because *he did not understand its intention!* To this dilemma, however, are those who take this ground reduced, and this is the point to which I wish to rivet the attention of the reader: either the *intention* of the law and of its framer was such as it was described by Mr. Pitt in the speech above referred to, or it was

not. If the former, then has the law been *wilfully* as well as grossly violated: if the latter, then was the law *intended to deceive* the people, the parliament, and the king, and, under the garb of reform, to carry on the work of corruption. Which of these Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt may choose, is to me, and, I believe, to the public in general, a matter of perfect indifference; but, one of the two it is impossible for them to avoid. And, upon this part of the subject, it only remains for me to observe, and for the reader well to remember, that it is a question to be determined by the select committee of the House of Commons now sitting, whether Mr. Pitt himself, he being first Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, did not connive at the withdrawing of the naval money from the bank of England for purposes of private emolument, and, of course, *whether he also* has not been "guilty of a gross violation of the law, and a high breach of duty."——

——2. Mr. Pitt asserted, in the debate of the 8th of April, that the public had sustained *no actual loss*, in consequence of the naval money having been diverted to, and employed for, purposes of private emolument. It has been clearly shown, and, I am persuaded, that there is not one man out of a thousand, who is not convinced, that, owing to the malversations of Lord Melville and Trotter, the actual loss of the nation has amounted to *many millions*. It has been shewn, that the contracting of the accomodating powers of the bank of England; the effect which the possession of such vast sums must have had upon the public funds; the encouragement to mal-practices amongst all the numerous persons entrusted with the receipt and payment of money in the several branches under the Treasurer of the Navy, striking instances of which encouragement and practices are exhibited in the affair of the defaulter Jellicoe, as well as in that of a person kept in office under Lord Melville after he had been detected of fraud; and in the well known fact of the non-payment of acceptances when they became due, in consequence of which the articles and labour obtained for the naval service must of necessity have been considerably enhanced in price. It has been shown, that, in all these ways, the malversations of Lord Melville and Mr. Trotter must have produced *actual loss* to the nation. Yet, because Lord Melville was not what is called a defaulter; because he, at going out of office, paid over to his successor the *mere balance* that he had in his hands; because this was the case, Mr. Pitt contended, that there had arisen, from the misapplication of the public money, no actual loss to the public. The fallacy of this position is so glaring, that little needs be said in answer to it; for, the reader has only to consider himself having large concerns the disbursement of which are managed by a steward, who, instead of calling upon his master for money no sooner than it is wanted, takes care to call for a sum always before-hand, and constantly to keep out at interest, for his own emolument, a sum that would otherwise be kept out at interest for the emolument of his master. If, at the end of several years of such practice, the master were to call him to account, what would such master think of the person who should tell him, as Mr. Pitt now tells the public, that, the steward having paid in the balance of the principal remaining in his hands, he, the master, has sustained *no actual loss*? But, it is my object to show, that Mr. Pitt himself could not be sincere in this assertion, and this I shall do by a reference to the speech which he made, on the 17th of Feb. 1785, upon introducing the very law that has been violated, and in which speech he had occasion to touch upon the subject of the balances that it had been customary to retain in the hands of the Receivers General of the Land Tax, who, it will be observed, defended the custom upon the ground of the insufficiency of their salaries. "The Commissioners," said he, "are induced to think, that the "Receiver General of the Land Tax is not "warranted" [though, observe, there was *no law* against it] "in the detention of the "public money, either by the difficulty of "procuring bills, or by the *insufficiency of "his salary*. These practices have been "considered by the Commissioners in a "proper point of view; for admitting that "the allowance is not adequate to his pains, "yet this is *not sufficient to justify him in "his detention of a considerable balance*. The "*community at large are greatly hurt* by "this mode of transacting business." Then, as to the degree in which the community are hurt, the following was his statement. "The Commissioners of Accounts have en-"deavoured to form some computation of "the *loss* sustained by the public from the "detention of the money by the Receiver "General, and, for that purpose, they called "for an account of the quarterly returns "made by him to the tax-office, whence it "appears, that the average amount in his "hands from the 5th of July, 1783, to the "6th of July following, was 334,061*l*. the "interest of which, at only 4 per centum, "being 13,362*l*. a year; and *this is the "sum, which, it is imagined, the public has "paid for want of the use of their money*." This was the doctrine of Mr. Pitt in 1785!

Let the reader judge, then, of the motive, whence has proceeded that which he has now advanced. All his principles appear to have undergone a total change. One would almost believe, that he is not the same man that bore the name of William Pitt twenty years ago.——3. Mr. Pitt endeavoured to persuade the public, that, because no personal corruption was positively proved; that is to say, because there was not positive proof of Lord Melvilles' having absolutely pocketed part of the gains made by Trotter, the conduct of Lord Melville was not corrupt. If this be admitted, there may still be harm in *taking* bribes, but none in *giving* them; and, supposing it were possible for the votes of one third part of the members of both Houses of Parliament to be purchased by a minister, he would still be, according to this doctrine, *innocent of corruption!*— Burke justly observes, that "it is by *bribing*, "and not so often by *being bribed*, that wicked "politicians bring ruin on mankind." And, indeed, the case is so plain, that there wants neither authority nor argument to enable even those the least accustomed to think, to form a correct opinion upon it, and decidedly to reject the doctrine inculcated by Mr. Pitt. The notion of confining the criminality of corruption to those who are the *receivers* appears to arise from the blackest and basest of all passions, *envy*; and envy, too, of the basest sort; envy of the success of those who barter their honour and their conscience for money. Of late years, there has not, in spite of all the patriotic efforts of Mr. Pitt to discover corruption in the conduct of his predecessors in office, been, till now, any minister of state, in England, publicly and seriously charged with that crime; and, therefore, we have no opinion of his to refer to on the subject, unless we were, which would not be liberal, to revert to his loose and declamatory charges against Lord North, who should, with all submission to the will of Providence, have lived till the present day! Yes, Lord North should have lived to see and to hear what is now to be seen and heard! But, though we have no opinion of Mr. Pitt upon record, we have the practice of the *other* Premier, his partner in the ministry. We have the records of the Court of King's Bench to inform us as to the principles, in this regard, upon which Mr. Addington (now Lord Sidmouth) acted. One HAMLIN, a TINMAN, at Plymouth, knowing that the place of surveyor of the customs for that port was become vacant, wrote to Mr. Addington, then prime minister, a letter as follows. "Sir, this day "a place became vacant, by the death of "Mr. A. Hill, landing surveyor of the customs here: of you can procure that place "for me, for my own use and benefit, I "will give you 2,000l. and also give a bond "to keep the business secret. Your answer will oblige, yours, &c. PHILIP HAMLIN; 20th Oct. 1801." This man was fined 100l. and imprisoned three months, soon after the expiration of which he died. I do not pretend to say, that the termination of his life was at all hastened by his sentence; nor do I say, or think, that his sentence was too severe. Could I have my will, a much heavier punishment should fall upon every reptile who is so base as to betray his country in this way; who is willing, not only to wink at, but to pay tribute to, great public robbers, so that he may be permitted to share, though but in the crumbs of the plunder. But, I cannot forbear to remark upon the wide difference between the punishment of this ignorant man and that of Lord Melville and Trotter. He tendered a bribe; he, too, would have been a briber. He did not, however, ask for a bribe. He was not, and did not want to be, a *receiver*. Yet we see, that no such lenient doctrine as that now set up in behalf of these great culprits, was ever attempted to be set up for him. The affidavits stated him to be a penitent sinner; that he was forty years of age; that a severe judgment would ruin both himself and his family; that he was totally ignorant that he was committing a crime. And, indeed, when we consider that there are miscreants who publicly advertise places under government for sale; and that no one is ever punished for such acts, need we wonder that a TINMAN should have supposed, that to offer to purchase was not a crime? It was nevertheless, a crime, and one that deserved punishment; but, what, then, does the crime of Lord Melville and Trotter deserve? The Attorney-General, who said, upon the trial of HAMLIN, that "he thought it due to the age "in which we lived, to state, that there "never was a period in the history of this "country, or any other, in which the "characters of persons in exalted stations "of public life *were so free from all sus-* "*picion of this species of offence as at the* "*present moment*," further stated, as the grounds of his demanding judgment, "that "Mr. Addington disregarded the matter, as "far as related to private feeling, but that "he thought it was his duty to bring the case "before the court *for the sake of public* "*example*." Perfectly proper; and, notwithstanding the jeers of the "young friends," upon the occasion, I have always believed, and do still believe, that the motive of Mr. Addington was perfectly sincere. But, surely,

the utility of public example cannot be confined to the poor and the ignorant! Surely such a principle of action is not calculated to diminish the prevalence of corruption, nor to inspire the people with those notions which they ought to entertain of the administration of justice! Lord Melville and Mr. Trotter are not to be exposed to a *criminal* prosecution. They are only to be *sued* for the recovery of what they have criminally taken from the public. They are both, not only at large, but rolling in wealth. Lord Melville still occupies very high offices; he is still in the receipt of about eight thousand pounds a year from the public purse; he is still one of His Majesty's "*most honorable* privy council," and still sits in the House of Peers!———— 4. Mr. Pitt resisted any further parliamentary proceedings as to matters that were to become the subject of investigation in the courts of law. He contended, that it was unjust to proceed further by the house as touching any matters that might be afterwards agitated in those courts; and, upon a division of the house, a majority voted with him on these grounds. This point needs occupy us no longer, Mr. Pitt himself having, in his speech of 19 May, 1783, upon the case of Powell and Bembridge, furnished us with an answer so complete as to leave us nothing to desire. "He took," says the reporter, "particular notice of the argument, that, because "a criminal prosecution was about to be instituted in the courts of Westminster hall, "therefore Messrs. Powell and Bembridge's "conduct was not a fit subject for inquiry "in that house. Such doctrine, he said, "went much farther than gentlemen were "aware. It nearly amounted to *a blow at* "*the constitution*, and, if admitted to any "extent, went to *the annihilation of some* "*of the most useful and valuable functions* "*of that house.*" There needs not a word by way of comment upon this. If there does, let those who are still his adherents furnish it.———— 5. Mr. Pitt proposed, defended, put to the vote, and carried, the mode of forming, by ballot, the select committee, now appointed and sitting to enquire into his own conduct. The reader will recollect, that, since the vote of censure against Lord Melville on the 8th of April, a motion has been made in the House of Commons, for prosecuting Lord Melville and Trotter criminally, which motion has been rejected, and it has been determined to institute only a civil suit; that another motion has been made to form a select committee, to inquire further into the matter of the Tenth Report; to find out when and how the naval money was applied (as is pretended) to other public services, with the knowledge of Mr. Pitt, such application being a gross violation of the law; to inquire upon what grounds the writ of privy seal excusing Lord Melville from paying the 24,000*l.*, due for Jellicoe's defalcation, was obtained by Mr. Pitt from the king; and to inquire whether Mr. Pitt participated with Lord Melville in the connivance at the withdrawing of the Naval Money from the Bank and employing it for purposes of private emolument. These are the mattters, to inquire into which this committee is appointed; and, it need hardly be observed, that Mr. Pitt is the person most deeply concerned. Well, now mark his conduct with respect to the choosing of the persons to compose this committee. Mr. Whitbread proposed a list of independent men: that was rejected, and Mr. Pitt made and carried a motion for choosing the committee *by ballot*; of doing which this is the mode. Every member in the House, or, at least every one that pleases, makes and gives in at the table a list of names equal in number to the number fixed on for the committee. These lists are then analysed, and, if the committee, as in the present case, consists of twenty-one members, the 21 persons chosen are those whose names occur oftenest upon the lists. Of course the minister, if he chooses to fix upon the persons to compose a committee is sure to have them in it, because, by sending round a list to his friends, who are a majority of the House, they all put in the same list, and, therefore, the 21 names that he has fixed on *must* occur oftenest. On the 29th of April, it having been found that *a list* had been sent round to the friends of the minister, Mr. Whitbread complained of it, read the list, and moved, that to send round lists of this sort, and, for such a purpose, was a breach of the privileges of the House; but, there was a majority against him, and, it was, of course, determined, that to send round the list in question *was justifiable!* On the 30th of April, the result of the ballot being reported, and the 21 names appearing to be exactly the same as those upon the circulated list, read by Mr. Whitbread the day before, he proceeded to move for the expunging of certain of the names for reasons assigned by him as follows. The names he particularly objected to were, SIR WILLIAM SCOTT, Judge of the Admiralty; SIR WILLIAM GRANT, Master of the Rolls; LORD DUNDAS, a member of the Board of Control; LORD CASTLEREAGH, President of the Board of Control; and MR. FOSTER, Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland. To all of these he objected as holding offices under the government, the latter three being at all times

removeable at the pleasure of the minister, whose conduct they were now appointed to inquire into. With respect to Sir William Scott, Sir William Grant, and Lord Castlereagh, he further objected upon the ground, that they had uniformly come to the House and *made oath*, that the duties of their offices respectively would not permit them to be absent to sit upon election committees; though, he observed, some of those committees did not last half a day. What, then, said he, can be the cause of their being selected for *this particular* committee! Nay, it so happened, that only a few minutes before the debate began, the Attorney General had had occasion to state to the House, that Sir William Scott's professional duties had prevented him, and *still did prevent him, from attending* to the passing of a little bill about the residence of stipendiary curates. Yet he was selected to attend to the important matters to come before this committee! LORD CASTLEREAGH was objected to by Mr. Whitbread upon grounds still stronger, and still more worthy of the attention of the people. Not only is he a placeman, and liable to be, at any time, displaced by Mr. Pitt; but he is, and long has been a colleague of Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville; he has been with both of them, and still is with Mr. Pitt, a member of the cabinet. But, the most powerful objection stated by Mr. Whitbread remains to be noticed, and, the better way will be to do it in his own words, as reported in the newspapers. He said, "the noble lord has, in "this House, been charged by the Right "Hon. gentleman, (MR. FOSTER) who now "sits there by his side, and who is to be with "him upon this committee; by that gentleman, and in my hearing" (it was on the "7th of May, 1802) "the noble lord was "charged with having, in Ireland, himself "*made use of the public money for the purpose of obtaining votes in favour of the union*; and, being so charged, he sat "*mute*, and has, at no time since, ventured "to deny the charge. Does he deny it "now? If he does, I shall go to *the proof* "by moving, that Mr. Foster be examined "at the bar." Lord Castlereagh rose, but not till after the intervention of ten other speeches, and then he did *not deny* the charge thus re-stated by Mr. Whitbread, though it was upon this ground principally, that Mr. Whitbread urged the propriety of expunging his name from the list of the committee, as being an improper person to be entrusted with an inquiry into the conduct of others charged with being concerned in a misapplication of the public money. "The "noble lord," said MR. GREY, who spoke after Lord Castlereagh, "has again been "pronouncing his panegyrics on the Irish "parliament who voted the Union; but, "the charge brought against the noble lord, "and which has not been resisted, is, *that "those votes were purchased by corruption.* "This is the charge; and with this charge "undenied, the noble lord goes into the "committee in company with the honourable gentleman, by whom the "charge has been made!" Leaving this to the sober reflection of the reader, I now proceed to dispose of the small space I have left, in comparing Mr. Pitt's present sentiments as to the use of the ballot, with those which he formerly expressed upon that subject; for, in no case, which is not a new one, do I wish him to be condemned, unless the condemnation can be fairly drawn from his own lips. When the selecting of the committee by ballot was represented to him, by Mr. Fox, as something too gross to pass unobserved or uncensured by the public, he insisted that it was the fair and constitutional way; and, in answer to the complaint of Mr. Whitbread, that he had *caused lists to be sent round*, he insisted, that, "to say, that the suggesting of a list to "the choice of members, was the use "of undue influence, seemed *an assertion "not at all correct.*" But, what was his language formerly, as recorded in the parliamentary debates? What were his sentiments in 1781? What did he think of this mode of balloting and of these *lists*, when it was likely that Lord North might have recourse to them for the selecting, from amongst the members of the house, commissioners *to inquire into abuses in the public expenditure?* Why, he said: "I will do the "noble lord so much justice as to declare "(if it be agreed to choose the commissioners here, by ballot), that I do not believe "the noble lord will interfere, and *make up "a list of names.* Such a mode of proceeding would be *too palpable*, too *gross "a mockery* of all justice, and all fairness, "for even the noble lord to venture: it "would be, at the same time, too shameful "an *avowal of influence* for the noble lord's "*tools* to submit to, pliant and accommodable as they are, and too gross even for "the *profligate impudence of his adherents "to defend!*"——Reader, are *you* a pliant and accommodable tool? Are *you* profligately impudent? Are you, then; can you be, an adherent of Mr. Pitt?

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.